

dy



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,847	12/19/2001	Richard D. Kreckel	SBC 0108 PA	6132

7590 07/21/2005
Robert P. Renke
Suite 250
28333 Telegraph Road
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2643

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,847

Applicant(s)

KRECKEL ET AL.

Examiner

Barry W. Taylor

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view of Driskell et al (6,072,493 hereinafter Driskell) further in view of Cauffman et al (5,325,290 hereinafter Cauffman).

Regarding claims 1 and 12. Walter teaches a system and method of processing a plurality of call detail records (CDRs) each indicative of a call transaction on a telecommunication network (see all especially col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25) comprising:

receiving a plurality of CDRs at a first controller, each of the CDRs having a data structure including a plurality of fields containing at least one character (col. 2 lines 41-42, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25);

selecting a first sorting field from the plurality of fields and grouping the plurality of CDRs as a function of data within the first sorting field (col. 2 lines 44-47, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25);

analyzing a second sorting field within each of the CDRs within a group of CDRs sorted by the first sorting field (col. 2 lines 47-49, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25); and

generating a report for each of the grouped CDRs as a function of data within the second sorting field (col. 2 lines 49-52, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25).

According to Applicant (see paper number 4, Amendment “A”, dated 6/02/2004, last four lines on page 7 and second to last paragraph on page 8), Walter first groups according to time stamp verses Applicant’s amended independent claim language of first grouping according to carrier identification field. The Examiner notes that sorting by time then by carrier as evident by Walter verses sorting by carrier then by time (see Applicant’s amended independent claims 1 and 12) is a matter of design choice and is not novel to one of ordinary skill in the art of filtering call detail records.

Next, Applicant’s amend independent claims 1 and 12 to deliver customized carrier specific report to a user terminal (see amendments to independent claims 1 and 12, paper dated 10/21/2004).

Art Unit: 2643

Driskell teaches system and method for associating services information with selected elements of an organization (title, abstract, and col. 1 lines 12-48) enabling users having a corporation the ability to break down cost into service categories correlated to multiple service providers (col. 1 line 49 – col. 2 line 56, col. 3 lines 1-23, lines 40-48, lines 57-60, col. 6 lines 28-37, col. 6 line 52 – col. 7 line 4, col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 26, col. 9 lines 55-58, col. 10 lines 38-49, col. 11 lines 4-58, col. 12 lines 11-60, col. 13 lines 41-52, col. 14 lines 24-65, col. 15 lines 6-28, col. 16 line 32 – col. 18 line 9, col. 20 lines 64-66, col. 21 lines 19-30, col. 22 lines 24-32, col. 24 lines 34-50, col. 25 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 24-25, col. 26 line 58 – col. 27 line 58, col. 28 lines 7-14) so that corporation may be able to forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year or spread certain charges by selected percentages across elements, members or departments of the organization (col. 23 lines 1-52). Driskell teaches correlating calls/minutes/dollars for each NPA-NXX serviced by different service providers (col. 27 line 27-58).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Driskell into the teachings of Walter to associate service information from multiple service providers as taught by Driskell for the benefit of further breaking down cost into service categories correlated to multiple services providers enabling a corporation to accurately forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year.

Applicants contend that Walter in view of Driskell fail to teach “customized carrier-specific report being selectively utile for monitoring network usage and making billing statements” (see paper dated 5/16/05).

Cauffman teach a billing system with data indexing that prepares and displays information concerning transactions between service providers and service customers including preprocessing of records relating to transaction details in order to create indices enabling rapid sorting of records (title, abstract, columns 1-3) and saving customers money (col. 2 lines 4-7). Cauffman allows customers to first sort by carrier in order to permit more rapid selection, processing and display of usage and cost information (col. lines 15-37, col. 4 line 3 – col. 5 line 22, columns 9-10, figures 37 and 40, col. 20 line 31 – col. 22 line 13).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Cauffman into the teachings of Walter in view of Driskell to first sort by carrier as taught by Cauffman for the benefit of creating indices so customers can rapidly sort call detail records to determine least cost facilities to use as taught by Cauffman (col. 1 lines 31-37, col. 2 lines 4-12).

Regarding claim 2. Walter teaches the plurality of CDRs are generated at a second controller (see 10 figure 1) remotely located from the first controller (see 16 figure 1) coupled to the telecommunication network.

Regarding claim 3. Walter teaches at least one of the plurality of fields includes a plurality of subfields (col. 3 lines 46-66).

Regarding claims 4, 16 and 20. Walter does not explicitly show the call transaction is a long distance calling card transaction. However, Walter discloses that other fields may be included (col. 3 line 57).

Driskell teaches system and method for associating services information with selected elements of an organization (title, abstract, and col. 1 lines 12-48) enabling users having a corporation the ability to break down cost into service categories correlated to multiple service providers (col. 1 line 49 – col. 2 line 56, col. 3 lines 1-23, lines 40-48, lines 57-60, col. 6 lines 28-37, col. 6 line 52 – col. 7 line 4, col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 26, col. 9 lines 55-58, col. 10 lines 38-49, col. 11 lines 4-58, col. 12 lines 11-60, col. 13 lines 41-52, col. 14 lines 24-65, col. 15 lines 6-28, col. 16 line 32 – col. 18 line 9, col. 20 lines 64-66, col. 21 lines 19-30, col. 22 lines 24-32, col. 24 lines 34-50, col. 25 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 24-25, col. 26 line 58 – col. 27 line 58, col. 28 lines 7-14) so that corporation may be able to forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year or spread certain charges by selected percentages across elements, members or departments of the organization (col. 23 lines 1-52). Driskell teaches correlating calls/minutes/dollars for each NPA-NXX serviced by different service providers (col. 27 line 27-58). Driskell also teaches call types of 3rd party, Calling Card, Custom Dialed, Conference and Collect (see bottom left side of figure 5) correlated to different service providers including AT&T, BELLSOUTH, MCI, SPRINT, etc. (see bottom left side of figure 6).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Driskell into the teachings of Walter to associate

Art Unit: 2643

service information from multiple service providers as taught by Driskell for the benefit of further breaking down cost into service categories correlated to multiple services providers enabling a corporation to accurately forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year.

Regarding claims 6 and 18-19. Walter teaches the second sorting field in an enhanced service (see col. 4 lines 23-25 wherein second sort field corresponds to call service and destination metric). Driskell also teaches call statistics relating to 3rd party, Calling Card, Custom Dialed, Conference and Collect calls (see bottom left side of figure 5) correlated to different service providers including AT&T, BELLSOUTH, MCI, SPRINT, etc. (see bottom left side of figure 6).

Regarding claim 7. Walter does not explicitly show receiving CDRs at daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly intervals.

Driskell teaches system and method for associating services information with selected elements of an organization (title, abstract, and col. 1 lines 12-48) enabling users having a corporation the ability to break down cost into service categories correlated to multiple service providers (col. 1 line 49 – col. 2 line 56, col. 3 lines 1-23, lines 40-48, lines 57-60, col. 6 lines 28-37, col. 6 line 52 – col. 7 line 4, col. 8 line 63 – col. 9 line 26, col. 9 lines 55-58, col. 10 lines 38-49, col. 11 lines 4-58, col. 12 lines 11-60, col. 13 lines 41-52, col. 14 lines 24-65, col. 15 lines 6-28, col. 16 line 32 – col. 18 line 9, col. 20 lines 64-66, col. 21 lines 19-30, col. 22 lines 24-32, col. 24 lines 34-50, col. 25 lines 50-56, col. 26 lines 24-25, col. 26 line 58 – col. 27 line 58, col. 28 lines 7-14) so that corporation may be able to forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year or

Art Unit: 2643

spread certain charges by selected percentages across elements, members or departments of the organization (col. 23 lines 1-52). Driskell teaches correlating calls/minutes/dollars for each NPA-NXX serviced by different service providers (col. 27 line 27-58).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to utilize the teachings of Driskell into the teachings of Walter to associate service information from multiple service providers as taught by Driskell for the benefit of further breaking down cost into service categories correlated to multiple services providers enabling a corporation to accurately forecast a budget for an upcoming fiscal year.

Regarding claims 8-10. Walter teaches using third sorting field (see CDR ANALYSIS section starting on column 5 line 35 wherein data indicative of call attempts).

Regarding claim 11. Walter teaches the report is a Trunk report (col. 1 lines 34-48, col. 3 lines 46-57, col. 4 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 11-35).

Regarding claim 13. Walter shows plurality of servers (see plurality of servers 18 figure 1).

Regarding claim 14. Walter shows plurality of remotely located clusters (see figure 1 wherein remote clusters 18 are remote from server 10).

Regarding claim 15. Walter shows master database (see 10 figure 1) in operative communication with each of the plurality of remotely located clusters (18 figure 1), the master database for storing each of the plurality of CDRs generated by each of the clusters.

Regarding claim 17. Walter teaches CDR fields comprise at least one of a call type, system failure, rate, method of recording, Message type or call statistics (see col. 4 lines 14-64, col. 8 lines 56-65). Driskell also teaches call types of 3rd party, Calling Card, Custom Dialed, Conference and Collect (see bottom left side of figure 5) correlated to different service providers including AT&T, BELLSOUTH, MCI, SPRINT, etc. (see bottom left side of figure 6).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

3. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2643

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W. Taylor, telephone number (571) 272-7509, who is available Monday-Friday, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached at (571) 272-7499. The central facsimile phone number for this group is **571-273-8300**.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group 2600 receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600, the 2600 Customer Service telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Centralized Delivery Policy: For patent related correspondence, hand carry deliveries must be made to the Customer Service Window (now located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314), and facsimile transmissions must be sent to the central fax number (571-273-8300).



Barry W. Taylor
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2600
Art Unit 2643



CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOL. CENTER 2600